

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

361

"As a vigilant, experienced American, who has real credentials as a Communist fighter—J. Edgar Hoover—has said, such actions play into Communist hands and hinder, rather than aid, the fight against communism."

The Attorney General says that the greatest problem in the United States is not the Communist Party here.

"The Communist Party," he says, "is directed and controlled by the Soviet Union. That has to be a matter of concern, but that is being studied and watched continuously by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

"An even greater problem is the espionage that goes on by representatives of Iron Curtain countries here in the United States. There's nothing a vigilante group is going to do about that."

FBI WATCHING SPIES

Kennedy says that the FBI is watching the spies from behind the Iron Curtain and doing a good job of it.

As for Robert Welch of the John Birch Society, Kennedy says he has claimed to have found only one Communist—former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Why has the Communist Party in the United States lost such an immense part of its membership?

The FBI gives a number of reasons—the prosecution of Communist Party members by the Government under laws passed by Congress, desertions by party members who have become disillusioned, effective work by the FBI and other agencies in the field of internal security, and a purging of those party members that the Red leaders in this country felt were not dedicated to the ideology of Marx and Lenin.

Although the FBI doesn't list it, the chief reason for the Communist Party's weakness in this country is that the climate is not congenial for Reds. The United States is a prosperous country, made up of people who for the most part cherish its freedoms, and who look upon the harsh, oppressive Communist system as hideous and abhorrent.

DANGER IS STRESSED

The FBI says that the Communist Party in the United States is dangerous in spite of the great shrinkage in its membership, and adds:

"The Communists operate on Leninist principles of organization; namely, that the party must be a small, select, hard-core group dedicated to violent revolution. The party through the fanaticism of its members and strategic placement in key industries and groups, is able time after time to wield an influence far out of proportion to its actual numbers.

Moreover, in times of emergency, Communist parties have the power of swift growth when ex-members may be reactivated. The party today consists of hard-core members with the weaklings, halfhearted and fainthearted winnowed out.

Another point might be mentioned: At times when party membership is small, an increased emphasis is placed on front groups. These fronts then become ever more important to the party as transmission belts to non-Communists."

Attorney General Kennedy has been saying in various parts of the country that the FBI is well able to handle the Communist threat.

REJECTED BY PEOPLE

"If we think that the great problem in the United States now is the fact that there are 10,000 Communists here," he said in Dallas, "if we think that that's what's going to destroy this country, we are in very bad shape."

He said in Columbia, S.C., more recently that the Communists have no political power in the United States because "they have been rejected by the American people." Anyway, he said, the FBI could handle the Com-

munist Party and also the problem of Communist spies from overseas.

"A vigilante group cannot deal with it," Kennedy said. "It takes expertise in the field of law enforcement. If any individual or group has information about Communists they should make that information available to the FBI.

"That seems to me an adequate way of dealing with the problem, not running around with guns and figuring that there are Communists in every corner. It is just not true.

"The great problem is strengthening our country so that we are going to be able to stand up to the Soviet Union."

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. Folliard cites FBI estimates that membership in the Communist Party of the United States has dropped from a peak of 80,000 in 1944 to between 8,000 and 10,000 members today. Although the Communist Party is still dangerous in spite of its shrinkage, Edward Folliard pointed out that as it has become smaller and weaker, the uproar against it by right-wing lunatic extremists has grown louder and louder. Communists in the United States seek to further the cause of the international Communist conspiracy as tools of the Kremlin. In the huge municipal stadium in Cleveland watching the Cleveland Browns, or at the Ohio State stadium in Columbus watching that great championship team playing a Big Ten opponent, of 80,000 spectators in attendance only 4 might be Communists. This on the basis of FBI estimates. Shades of Valley Forge, Gettysburg, or the Normandy beachhead. Do we need self-appointed vigilantes of the John Birch Society to reinforce our police departments, FBI, and our Armed Forces?

I suspect that if the truth were known, many extremists bemoan the fact that Communist influence and membership has declined markedly. These demagogues of the rightwing fringe are finding it increasingly difficult to cloak their real ambitions for a Fascist-like totalitarian form of government in the United States.

Radicals of the "right" practice character assassination without regard for the truth, threaten merchants with boycotts, and threaten college professors and school principals with dismissal. They spread fear, hatred, and suspicion. They ignore the very real menace of aggression from Communists in the Kremlin and from Red China.

These are the tactics required to undermine a free society and democratic institutions. In their attempt to spread fascism, a sister ideology of communism, leading John Birchers are in reality furthering Communist aims. In my judgment, the John Birch Society and others of a like ilk unless fully exposed might be as serious a threat to our security and way of life as is internal communism.

The President has strongly denounced these extremists. Attorney General Robert Kennedy has called them a tremendous danger—a tremendous disturbance to our system of government. J. Edgar Hoover has stated that their actions play into Communist hands and hinder, rather than aid, the fight against com-

munism. Our leaders and the press are performing a great service in informing Americans of the dangers inherent in the activities of these rightwing lunatics.

With the people informed, this totalitarianism of the right will be rejected and our traditional American way of life will continue to flourish.

Mr. President, we must hold fast to our heritage as free men and women. We must renew our confidence in each other, our tolerances, and our sense of being good neighbors.

We must repudiate the lunatic fringe of the right and of the left—those men of small faith, or none whatever, plotting to overthrow our free society.

PASSPORT PROCEDURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial entitled "Passport Procedure." It is one of the finest, one of the most able and, in my judgment, one of the most penetrating analyses of this problem that I have ever been privileged to read in any newspaper in this country. As one who for years has tried to be a student of the Constitution, I wish to extend to the writer of the editorial on the editorial staff of the Washington Post, whoever he may be, my very sincere congratulations. I think the editorial helps to clear the public opinion atmosphere in regard to this problem. A great public service has been rendered by the editorial.

I do not feel that the editorial, in fact, violates the spirit and the intent of the policy, custom and rule of the Congress in regard to insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of any material that comments critically upon other Members of Congress. I do not think that my friend Representative WALTER would disagree with that observation, although this editorial comments upon his position on an issue which is contrary to my position on the issue. Therefore, subject to the advice of the Parliamentarian, which I have not had time to seek, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the editorial be printed in the RECORD which makes no reference to any other Member of Congress. But if it would be within the rules to have printed in the RECORD the entire editorial, I would like to have it all in, because I think in its entirety it will be very much more helpful to the reader.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSPORT PROCEDURE

"The right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the fifth amendment." So said the Supreme Court of the United States when it decided the Kent case in 1958. In deference to the Supreme Court, the Department of State a few days ago issued new passport regulations providing a due process hearing and appeal for anyone to whom a passport may be denied. For this deference to judicial authority, Representative FRANCIS WALTER accused the Department of violating law and contemptuously disregarding Congress.

The Department's new passport regulations provide that in the hearing and appeal

available when a passport is denied, the applicant shall be accorded the right to appear, to be represented by counsel, to present evidence, to be informed of the evidence against him and the source of such evidence, and to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses. These are the essential elements of due process. Rooted in experience, they afford indispensable means toward the rendering of fair and reasonable judgments.

Mr. WALTER wants the Department of State to abandon these procedures. He wants the Department to deny passports to citizens of the United States on the mere say-so of anonymous informers, without allowing the applicant to confront the informers and cross-examine them, without allowing even the officials of the Department to know the identity of the informers. Apart from the fact that the Supreme Court has expressly declared that such procedure is forbidden by the Constitution, it is forbidden by commonsense as well. For decisions based on such evidence are not judgments at all; they are nothing more than capricious and arbitrary guesses.

No one can question Mr. WALTER's zeal to protect American security. But what kind of America will he have made secure if its citizens can be denied constitutional rights and deprived of liberty by the mere whim of administrative officers? We congratulate the Department of State for restoring fairness to its passport procedures. "For," as Judge Charles Fahy put it recently in an essay on "The Right To Travel," "liberty is precious and one may be deprived of it only by methods which are fair and for reasons which are sound and rest on the common good, on a good so great as to outweigh in some circumstances the great good of individual liberty."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was so moved by the editorial that I saw fit to send a letter to the Attorney General of the United States this morning on the subject of passports because, as Senators know, for years I have taken a very definite position in the Senate in regard to the constitutional questions that have been involved in the passport controversy. I wrote to the Attorney General as follows:

Hon. ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: This letter is to advise you of my gratification with the regulations you worked out with the Department of State to govern the issuance of passports to persons believed to be Communists. In my opinion, it is long past time for the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government to observe the provisions of the Constitution which too often are left to the courts alone to protect.

I know from my own experience that this area of domestic security against the Communist conspiracy is one of the most misunderstood issues of the cold war. As you know, after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the State Department could not withhold passports in the absence of legislative authority to do so, the previous administration tried to get Congress to pass such legislation. Unfortunately, it also sought congressional sanction of the use of star-chamber methods in determining whether a passport should be withheld.

The use of secret information available only to the official making the decision and denied to the individual who is exercising a given right is nothing but a police-state procedure. Whether the practice is used in connection with passports or any other official matter, it is the earmark of totalitarianism. It certainly is one of the principal abuses of Executive power from which our constitu-

tional forefathers tried to save the American people.

The right to know the identity of an accuser, to know the nature of the accusation, and the right to offer rebuttal are basic to due process of law. It is always astonishing to me that some people would destroy these Constitution guarantees of due process of law in the name of defending the Constitution.

It was for this reason that I opposed this legislation in 1958 and again in 1959. I especially objected to the attempt to rush a bill through the Congress in the closing days of the 85th Congress, with only a few days of hearings. I therefore objected to the holding of hearings while the Senate was in session, and as a result, no final action was taken. It was rather shocking to me that when members of the Foreign Relations Committee proposed legislation authorizing the withholding of passports with proper procedural safeguards, the Department of State declared: "Moreover, the Department must oppose any provision which might require the Secretary to make his determination on a particular passport application only on the basis of information and sources thereof which could be disclosed in open court."

Obviously, to make the determination on any other basis is repugnant to the terms and to the principles of our Constitution. I am pleased that you have now made this perfectly clear. I am also pleased that this battle I waged against police-state methods has been vindicated, and I am so informing Mr. Roger Jones, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, as well as yourself.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, this announced policy of the administration represents a very important contribution to constitutional guarantees on the part of this administration. It is a reaffirmation, with no question of doubt, with no equivocation, that these precious constitutional rights of due process will be respected by this administration. I congratulate the President of the United States that under his administration this very clear and unequivocal position in regard to the passport issue has been announced.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am one who is very much disturbed and concerned about the discussions which have been carried on in the press with respect to the nomination of Mr. McCone as Director of the CIA. I have reached no final determination as to my own position on that nomination, because all the facts are not in. Before I make my final decision, I shall await the hearings before the committee, the report of the committee, and my own analysis of the record as it is finally presented to me as a Member of the Senate.

I do most respectfully say, however, in view of the information which has already been publicized, that the burden of proof is on the administration to justify this nomination. Every shadow of doubt as to the qualification of this nominee ought to be removed.

Mr. President, we are dealing here with an operation of an agency which also gives me great concern as a constitution-

alist. We are dealing here with an agency in which the people do not have very effective checks as of now. We are dealing here with an agency whose operations are conducted in complete secrecy, even so far as the elected representatives of a free people in the Congress of the United States are concerned.

I hold to the point of view that in our Republic the adoption of procedures of complete secrecy are difficult to justify under our constitutional system. I have never been one who holds to the point of view that the CIA should be allowed to operate as it now operates, in complete secrecy with respect to the attaining of knowledge of its actions by the elected representatives of a free people in the parliamentary body in our form of government, which is the Congress of the United States. Why do I say that? I say it as a constitutionalist. I find great difficulty reconciling the granting of such power to the CIA with that basic safeguard of freedom guaranteed to our people by the Constitution known as the check and balance system.

Where is the check on the CIA? Mr. President, do not tell me that the check is to be found in the office of the Presidency of the United States. I speak quite impersonally. It makes no difference to me who occupies the Presidency of the United States when we deal with a question of constitutional power and constitutional guarantees. I say, as I have said before, it is not safe for freedom to grant any agency of government, no matter how much it is attempted to cloak it under the name of security, the unchecked power now vested in the CIA.

Therefore, when the nomination for Director of CIA comes to the floor of the Senate, as long as that unchecked power remains vested in the CIA, it is incumbent upon us to see that the greatest care be exercised by us under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution in respect to that nomination. Unless every shadow of doubt is removed from this nominee as to his qualification, the senior Senator from Oregon will not possibly be able to vote for the confirmation of the nomination.

More than that, I believe that when the nomination is under consideration may be a fitting time to raise this whole question of unchecked CIA power on this side of the aisle. Much has been heard on this side of the aisle in recent years, when a representative of the party of the opposition occupied the White House, in respect to the CIA. As far as I am concerned, these issues are always two-way streets. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Democratic side of the aisle in the Senate in this session of Congress to take a long, hard look at the question as to whether we are going to continue to permit the CIA to function with unchecked power, so far as the legislative branch of the Government is concerned, which is irreconcilable, in my opinion, with the very precious constitutional guarantee of checks and balances.

Mr. President, do not tell me that it is not safe to permit the elected parliamentary officials of a free people to take a look at the activities of the CIA,

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

363

but that it is perfectly safe to allow a considerable number of unelected people, who never had to meet the challenge of a free ballot box in this Republic—not only on the staff of the CIA, but down in the Pentagon and in the State Department and at the White House staff level—to have knowledge as to the operations of the CIA. It is difficult to justify permitting appointed staff members of the executive branch to have access to CIA information and then say that the elected representatives of a free people must not have access to the activities, the maneuverings and, yes, sometimes, as I am satisfied, and as we already know and the record shows, manipulations in the field of foreign policy by CIA.

With the issue of war and peace so nip and tuck in our time, it is all the more important that we see to it that the check and balance policy of our Constitution be carried out in full.

Therefore the senior Senator from Oregon will continue to support, may I say to my Democratic colleagues—and I hope there will be sufficient Republican support—the passage of legislation in this session of Congress which places a congressional check on the CIA.

The time to consider it is now, when we have before the Senate of the United States the question of the confirmation of the nomination of the head of the CIA.

What are we afraid of? Freedom? What are we afraid of? The constitutional principles of the organic law of this land, which become meaningless if we sacrifice the check and balance system?

I am for as much check on the congressional branch of the Government as I am for a check on the executive branch. However, here in respect to the CIA we have an unchecked executive power that ought to be brought to an end.

We need to keep in mind that foreign policy is not the property of the President. The foreign policy of the United States is the property of the American people—all of them. All the President is, as I have said many times before, is the administrator of the people's foreign policy. I am concerned about being confronted with after-the-fact situations—after the CIA has created problems, as it has in the past—in certain foreign lands, which, in my judgment, have caused embarrassment to the United States. I speak as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. It is well known by members of my subcommittee that I am not too happy about some of the manipulations by the CIA in Latin America in times gone by. I think the policies of the CIA ought to be changed. What is wrong with that? What are we afraid of?

Do not tell me, Mr. President, that to preserve freedom, we must adopt the police state methods of communism or fascism. I renounce that theory. However, I see no escape from the premise that if we continue to tolerate the unchecked power of the CIA, we are adopting a police state procedure.

Let the record be clear as to what the operations of the CIA, in part, are. They

deal with the whole question of espionage. They deal with the whole question of spy activity. This is necessary. I have joined in voting millions of dollars for such activities of the CIA and shall continue to do so in the interest of security. However, I only insist upon the exercise of the constitutional right of Congress to check upon the work of that agency, which deals with espionage and spy activities. Apparently we have come to the pass where today it is necessary to have legislation for that purpose. That was not true in the early history of the Republic. What is needed is to review the relationship between Congress and the executive in the early history of the Government. Would we have told Webster or Calhoun, or any of the other great forefathers who trod the carpet of this great parliamentary Chamber, that it was necessary to have legislation to enable the legislative branch of the Government to find out what the executive branch of the Government was doing in some cloak-and-dagger operation somewhere in the world which might very well involve the suffering and the lives of tens upon tens of thousands of American boys? What would Jefferson have said about such an unchecked power at the time of his Presidency? All of these forefathers and many more would have thrown up their hands in horror at the suggestion that this was not an inherent right of Congress, ingrained in our constitutional system. As a matter of right, Congress should know what the CIA is doing, has done, and contemplates doing in connection with its operations in any foreign land.

I am one who believes that in this year of 1962 we may very well determine the whole future, if there is to be one, of the history of the United States.

I say most respectfully to my President—and I use the word in its proper sense—I truly love him for his great statesmanship and leadership. However, I say to my President, from the floor of the Senate today, that the greatest defense weapon which the American people have is the Constitution of the United States, with all the guarantees of procedural rights specifically spelled out and clearly inherent in it, and unanswerably implied, as well. With the utmost respect for the President of the United States, I raise the question: Why continue, under your administration, this unchecked, unreviewable policy of the CIA in the field of foreign policy? It is such unchecked power that can cause a war. Once the war situation is created and the incident has occurred, even though it might constitute a second "sinking of the Maine," there is no question as to what the action of Congress has to be.

We are in a situation in which we shall probably never again see Congress pass a declaration of war prior to the beginning of war. I think the probabilities are much greater that war will have started and that Congress, after the fact, will declare war. That is why this Senator is so much concerned about the unchecked power, exercised by the CIA or any other agency of Government.

So I raise my voice today with this warning, because a full discussion of the facts of the problem should not be avoided in the consideration of the McCone nomination.

I close by saying that I shall make my final decision on the McCone nomination when the whole record is in. But my administration has the burden of proof on that record, because from the objections and such documentation as I have already read, the administration cannot escape that burden of proof. We have been reading in recent days allegations, supported by documentation, which has been offered us for our consideration, but which, I hasten to add, should be subjected to the most thorough cross examination and analysis, in the form of a series of columns written by Drew Pearson. I have referred to Drew Pearson on other occasions, even when he has dipped his pen in my blood, as well as that of other Senators, to be undoubtedly the most able and effective muckraker of our time. But let us also recognize that the muckrakers throughout our history have performed a great public service to the American people. They are needed. Sometimes I think their breed should multiply. Be that as it may, I think the columns of Drew Pearson concerning McCone certainly place upon the administration the burden of proof of answering them, because we are hearing from home about them. What do we read in the letters which come in, as they are coming in to me? "Is this true? Is that true? Is this true about this nominee as I read today or yesterday or the day before yesterday, in a Pearson column?"

I understand that as of January 17, 1962, Mr. Pearson wrote a column on the McCone nomination which was rather heavily edited by clipping shears by many newspapers. By that I mean that his article was not printed in full. I shall offer that column for printing in full at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire column written by Drew Pearson, and published by the Bell Syndicate on January 17, 1962, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN McCONE DID NOT SELL HIS STOCK WHEN HE BECAME AEC CHAIRMAN—HIS SHIPPING LINES DID PROFITABLE BUSINESS WITH AEC CONTRACTORS—THE LAW DOES NOT PERMIT ANY CHOICE ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—In June 1958, John A. McCone, the new would-be Central Intelligence Chief, wrote a letter to Sherman Adams, later kicked out of Government for a conflict of interest, to see whether he, McCone, might have a conflict of interest as new Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Ignoring the fact that the Goldfine charges against Adams had not made him the best man to act as Judge, McCone listed the Utah Construction Co., Kaiser Engineers, Dow Chemical, Union Carbide as doing large business with the Atomic Energy Commission, and simultaneously doing business with his own privately owned shipping companies.

Significantly, two of these companies, Kaiser and Utah Construction, showed the pattern of business links McCone has kept

January 18

with his old associates and war profiteers. McCone was president and a partner with Henry Kaiser and associates in running the California Shipbuilding Co. during the war when they rolled an investment of \$100,000 into an overall profit of \$44 million.

Later, when he was Under Secretary of the Air Force, McCone gave his old partner a quickie Flying Boxcar contract at three times the cost the Air Force was paying Fairchild. Incidentally, Senate hearings conducted by the late Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, showed that Kaiser and his subsidiaries got a total of \$219,011,919 in Government RFC loans; received \$6,568 million in Government contracts, and got approximately half a billion dollars in quickie tax writeoffs.

BIG AEC CONTRACTORS

Kaiser has also been one of the biggest contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission including the period when Kaiser's old partner, John McCone, was AEC Chairman.

The company which operates under the all-inclusive name of Utah Construction Co. is also part-owned by Kaiser and actually is a big seller of uranium to the AEC through its subsidiary, Lucky Mc Uranium Corp.

Union Carbide is one of the biggest contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission. It not only sells uranium to the AEC, but operates AEC Plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Paducah, Ky. Both Union Carbide and the Kaiser interests benefited from the AEC's decision not to buy uranium from "underdeveloped countries." This obviously played into the hands of established American companies such as Union Carbide and Kaiser.

Yet McCone, before he became Chairman of the AEC in 1958, admitted that his personally owned shipping line, Joshua Hendy, handled "intercoastal and coastwise transportation of chemicals, transports products for Union Carbide, Dow Chemical, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Standard Oil of California, and others."

"I have some business relationships with Kaiser," he also testified, "inasmuch as a jointly owned company, 25 percent of which is owned by Hendy and 50 percent by Kaiser Aluminum, has a long-range contract to transport Kaiser's bauxite."

"Would your firm continue to deal with these firms in the atomic energy field, such as Union Carbide?" asked Senator CLINT ANDERSON of New Mexico.

"Yes, I would expect they would continue," replied the future AEC Chairman.

"Union Carbide is a large customer of Hendy's" ANDERSON reminded him.

"Yes, they are," McCone agreed.

ADAMS GIVES HIS OK

However, he insisted that placing the stock of his shipping companies in trust with the Bank of California, in which he is also a stockholder, cleared him of any conflict of interest. This left him, however, with the profits which would accrue from the contracts his shipping companies made from Union Carbide, Kaiser, and the other firms which did business with the AEC of which he was Chairman. In other words, while he was AEC Chairman, his shipping companies would benefit from business with AEC contractors.

On the basis of this, Sherman Adams, that great judge of conflict of interest, OK'd the arrangement; and the Senate, diverted by the Sherman Adams-Goldfine headlines, also OK'd it and confirmed McCone as AEC Chairman.

However, now that McCone is coming up for another, even more important, post, head of Central Intelligence, the Senate might take time to review the record and study the law.

The conflict-of-interest law gives no choice either to McCone or to the Senate.

McCone said he had done "A great deal of soul-searching" and had concluded he could handle the AEC Chairmanship without any favoritism. However, the AEC law does not permit a man to search his soul and make the decision. The law makes the decision for him. It gives no alternatives other than get out of any conflict with private business interests.

"No member of the commission," it reads, "shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the commission."

The law was passed not to be rationalized after soul-searching, but to make sure that men like McCone did not serve on this powerful commission with the power to make tremendous profits for certain companies, unless they gave up their stock in the companies which benefited. This McCone did not do, and in an early column, one significant result affecting McCone's private shipping line will be reported.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to my administration: Take a look at it. I want to know what the answers to it are. If those charges cannot be supported with facts, I want to know it. If the charges can be supported with facts, I do not see how I could possibly vote in favor of confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. President, I have taken the time to discuss the nomination in the entire framework of CIA power because I do not believe the two can be separated. I ask my administration to take another look at the question of whether this is the time for Congress to pass legislation setting up what frequently has been described as a congressional watchdog committee, with authority to find out, in behalf of the American people—which I believe is a constitutional obligation of the Congress—the facts about the CIA operations the world around.

UNITED STATES IN A CHANGING WORLD OF TRADE; RIGHTWING RETREAT FROM FREEDOM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, two very interesting leaflets issued by what I consider to be a very effective lay educational organization in the country, one which is on a footing, in my judgment, with another great lay organization, the League of Women Voters, which is also a great study group. The National Council of Jewish Women is another of the great lay educational organizations, and I believe it carries out rather well the observations, published yesterday in the New York Times, in an article written by James Reston, in connection with the duty of the women of America to proceed immediately to take a careful look at some of the great public issues which confront the Congress, and to be heard from, as is not only their right, but also, I believe, is their duty.

So I ask unanimous consent that if the article written by James Reston has not already been ordered printed in the RECORD, it be ordered printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1962]
How To SAVE KENNEDY FROM CONGRESS
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—President Kennedy has started the new year by emphasizing the importance of improving the education of the American people, but it is the theme of this epistle that he won't get very far unless the women of the country come to his rescue.

What the President wants is to stamp out illiteracy (beginning presumably in the Congress and the press) and get through a program of Federal aid for public school construction, teachers' salaries, and college buildings and scholarships, with special emphasis on the training of scientists, engineers and technicians.

It is a demonstrable fact that we cannot control the scientists, engineers and technicians we already have and therefore need more philosophers, teachers, diplomats and nonatomic statesmen, but let that go for the minute. The point is that the President is ringing the school bell again, and needs help.

He is not likely to get much from the politicians. His bill to aid the colleges is in pretty good shape, but his general bill to help the public schools is hopelessly lost in a tangle of political and religious controversies. Somehow the present angry dialog has to be changed. Somebody has to find a new way to get around old men and old problems, and since women have been doing precisely that for several thousand years, why not pass the problem to them?

THE MUZZLED FACTS

The difficulty at the moment is that the facts have been obscured in a torrent of emotional arguments over Federal aid leading to Federal control of the classrooms; over the constitutionality of giving Federal funds to parochial schools; over racial integration in the public schools, and over State and local rights.

These are the things that have dominated the news of the education debate for years. By the time the story of the President's education bills gets out over the news wires into most local communities it is usually a report of conflict between Republican versus Democrat, North versus South, public versus parochial schools, Federal versus State or local control. There are exceptions, but this is the shorthand of it.

The question is whether there is a way to get the whole problem of modern education discussed calmly in all the communities of the country, large and small; not only the emotional, religious, racial, regional, political, and constitutional issues, all of which are important, but the facts as well.

The growth of the population is a fact. The shortage of classrooms and teachers is a fact. The replacement of unskilled labor by automatic machinery is a fact. The movement of kids from poorly educated communities into the competition of highly educated urban communities is a fact. Finally, the educational need of the Nation in the cold war is a very solemn fact.

From the days of the frontier in this country, the women have been civilizing their men and educating their kids (when they could catch them). In the little town, it is the women who have organized and attended the monthly book clubs and tried to cultivate the baboons they married and bring a little gentility into the house. In the larger cities in more recent years, it is the women again who have run the world affairs councils and brought the poets and lecturers to the community.

HOW TO DO IT

The educated women who are bored with the old man's lockerroom, barroom, and commercial shop talk are the greatest unused natural resource in this country today.